

GOV 679HA: Honors Tutorial in Government

Fall 2011
unique # 38860
Mondays, 3:00-6:00 p.m.
Garrison 0.120

Prof. John P. McIver
Office: BAT 3.134
Office Hours: MWF 11:00-12:00 and by Appt.
Phone: (512) 232-7271
E-mail: mciver@austin.utexas.edu

Class webpages:

Webpace: https://webpace.utexas.edu/jm59399/www/Honors/HTML/679HA_idx.html

Blackboard: Additional supplemental materials will be available on BB. You may also use BB to communicate with the instructor or with classmates.

Course Overview

The Honors Tutorial is a year-long course designed to provide undergraduates with an opportunity to conduct original research in an area of Government of their interest. This year, the Fall course for students interested in American politics, comparative politics, and international relations will be taught by Prof. John McIver. The seminar will introduce students to a variety of research methods and function largely as a forum to develop a thesis project, test out ideas, and present research findings in a structured, collegial setting. This is a demanding course designed for dedicated students who already possess good academic writing skills and are prepared to learn new research techniques in pursuit of their thesis topics. Much of the work will be self-directed. In addition, each student will be expected to complete all required readings before class, participate actively in class discussions, meet regularly with a primary advisor, and hand in written assignments on time. In the second semester, students are expected to complete a thesis under the supervision of their primary advisor, a regular, full-time professor in the Government Department of the student's choosing (subject to mutual agreement, of course).

The Honors Thesis project is intended to:

- Provide students with experience in developing a substantial research project;
- Allow students to investigate a topic and conduct original research in an area of particular interest;
- Create a context in which students will be engaged in scholarly exchange with peers in the honors seminar and Government Department faculty; and

- Expose students to the kinds of challenges involved in research and analysis at the graduate level.

Students who write an honors thesis also work closely with a primary advisor who has expertise in the student's area of research. The primary advisor will be involved in all stages of the project and will be the student's sole advisor during spring semester.

Honors theses are much more substantial than term papers written for an upper-division Government class. In general, students will be expected to have a strong working knowledge of the most prominent literature in the field immediately related to their topic. The thesis itself will combine this knowledge with a measure of originality in terms of evidence, data, and interpretation, and stand as a notable personal and scholarly achievement at the close of the course. Completion of the tutorial may (but will not necessarily) enable the student to graduate with "Special Honors in Government." The primary advisor will evaluate the quality of the thesis to determine whether it merits this distinction. In addition, students receiving honors must meet specified college and departmental semester hour and minimum grade point average requirements.

Requirements and Deadlines

The quantity of assigned readings for the course is moderate, but keep in mind that a tremendous amount of outside reading and writing related to individual projects is required.

Required readings:

- A set of materials (book chapters and journal articles) available on-line at the class website.
- Other students' work-in-progress as assigned.
- Special readings tailored to each student's needs as assigned by each student's individual primary advisor.

I recommend you consider purchasing three books:

- A basic textbook that we will use to motivate discussion is Janet B. Johnson, H. T. Reynolds and Jason Mycoff *Political Science Research Methods*, 7th Edition (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2012). The 5th or 6th editions by Johnson and Reynolds will work as well. (Note: You can get used versions of the 5th or 6th editions from Amazon or Barnes & Noble. The 7th edition is about \$100.) If you've not had a course on research design, this book is a reasonable introduction to the topic that should prove useful.
- Dona M. Wong (2010) *The Wall Street Journal Guide to Information Graphics: the Do's and Don'ts of Presenting Data, Facts and Figures*. New York: W. W. Norton. (@Amazon or Barnes & Noble for \$19.) This book provided a wide variety of ways to present quantitative data in interesting and informative ways.
- Diane E. Schmidt (2004/2009) *Writing in Political Science: A Practical Guide*. (3rd or 4th edition) Longman. (Amazon or Barnes & Noble sells the 4th edition for about \$46 while Amazon sells the 3rd edition for about half that price.) We could all write better. The author offers helpful suggestions by which we might improve.

During the fall semester, students will develop a research proposal, read extensively in their research area, and draft the introductory chapter of their thesis. In order to complete these tasks effectively, it is essential that students establish a solid working relationship with their primary advisor immediately. I can't stress this enough. Students must also complete several short written assignments, read and comment on their peers' research, and participate actively in class discussions.

Note the following important *deadlines* for this fall:

- 1) On **September 10th**, students should hand in a one-page preliminary proposal and bibliography.
- 2) **Every other week**, students will hand in a brief progress report, due in class, specifying what they planned to do the previous week and what they accomplished as well as what they plan to do the following week. Reports should also include a brief statement about how each activity will help build the final thesis project. Reports should be very brief and should only take minutes to complete. Note that these reports will not be "corrected"/handed back.
- 3) On **October 8th** all students will submit a draft thesis proposal and preliminary bibliography. Please also give this assignment to your primary supervisor. The proposal should be approximately 7 pages double-spaced; the bibliography must be presented in a standard format, should be at least 2 pages single-spaced, and should use scholarly books and articles as sources. Proposals should identify the research question/puzzle to be addressed in the thesis, explain its theoretical and/or substantive importance, outline a research strategy, and indicate expected findings. (More information on the content and format of proposals will be provided during the semester.)
- 4) On **November 12th**, all students will hand in a revised and expanded thesis proposal and bibliography. The updated version should reevaluate the project in light of research and faculty and peer input thus far in the semester and increasingly take on the feel of a draft chapter 1 of the thesis. Based on your ongoing work, again identify your research question, explain its importance, summarize your research strategy, and indicate what you expect to find. The text of this version should be about 12-16 pages in length, double-spaced and should include an updated and expanded bibliography.
- 5) Before Thanksgiving, those who are performing research on human subjects (surveys, focus groups, in-depth interviews) will need to submit their research projects to the Internal Review Board for Human Subjects Approval. This approval process can take several weeks or longer, and research involving human subjects cannot be performed until this approval process is complete. The Honors Advisor will help you navigate the system. Your best weapons, as in most of life, are an early start and persistence.
- 6) On **December 3rd** all students must submit a complete/final first chapter **to both the honors advisor and their thesis supervisor**. This chapter should be about 20-25 pages, double-spaced. It should introduce the subject of the thesis and pose its main research questions and hypotheses. The chapter should also include a literature review, introduce the cases to be examined (e.g., countries, court cases, elections, whatever you are studying), and discuss the research strategy and data to be used. This introductory chapter should conclude with a tentative outline, devoting approximately one paragraph to describing the contents and

structure of each thesis chapter to follow, and a bibliography. The citations should be complete and in a proper, standard format. Students will receive permission to enroll in the spring semester of the Honors Tutorial based on an assessment of this draft chapter.

- 7) Students are **required** to meet with their individual primary advisor at least once every three weeks for a total of at least four meetings in the fall semester. The first meeting should occur before September 10, the second before October 1, the third before October 28 and the fourth before December 3.

Grading

The Honors Tutorial is a two-semester course that requires students to complete and successfully defend an honors thesis.

Grades for GOV 679HA (the fall semester tutorial) will be assigned by the course instructor based on an assessment of your progress in the program including: quality and rate of progress on the thesis project (especially your first chapter due at the end of the semester); assessments of peers' work and other assignments; in-class participation, and your record of meeting deadlines. I will make these judgments assessment but I will ask for input from your individual thesis advisor before assigning a final grade.

The course will be graded much like a graduate class. That is, the grade range is realistically A to C in which C is effectively a failing grade. A and A- grades are my signals that I think you have done a good job. B grades indicate that I'm not certain you're doing adequate work and it may not be appropriate for you to move on with your project in the spring semester.

Students making sufficient progress on their thesis project at the close of the fall semester will be admitted to the spring semester of the Honors Tutorial. Each student's individual primary advisor will assign spring grades and decide on whether or not you receive Special Honors at graduation.

UT Policies

Disabilities:

Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259. Their website is <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>.

Religious holidays:

Students who miss class or assignment due dates due to observance of religious holidays may make them up. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.") But please let me know in advance.

University Honor Code:

The core values of the University of Texas at Austin are learning, discovery, freedom, leadership, individual opportunity, and responsibility. Each member of the University is expected to uphold these values through integrity, honesty, trust, fairness, and respect toward peers and community.

Please familiarize yourself with the university's definition of and policies regarding plagiarism.

See http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/scholdis_plagiarism.php
and <http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/students/writing/plagiarism.pdf>.

Plagiarism “occurs if you represent *as your own work* any material that was obtained from another source, regardless of how or where you acquired it.” Plagiarism is the most egregious form of academic dishonesty and if you succumb to it in this course, you will fail and be referred to the Dean of Students with my recommendation that you be expelled from the university. On the bright side, plagiarism is incredibly easy to avoid by using copious citations and, when necessary, quotations. When in doubt, cite others. You will notice that virtually all academic work follows this rule and has many citations. If you would like advice about particular instances or issues, please see me.

Emergency Evacuation Policy:

Occupants of buildings on The University of Texas at Austin campus are required to evacuate buildings when a fire alarm is activated. Alarm activation or announcement requires exiting and assembling outside.

Familiarize yourself with all exit doors of each classroom and building you may occupy. Remember that the nearest exit door may not be the one you used when entering the building.

Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructor in writing during the first week of class.

In the event of an evacuation, follow the instruction of faculty or class instructors.

Do not re-enter a building unless given instructions by the following: Austin Fire Department, The University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.

Behavior Concerns Advice Line (BCAL): 232-5050

Emergency Information Web Site: <http://www.utexas.edu/emergency>

General Advice

Writing an honors thesis can be one of the most rewarding experiences of an undergraduate career, but it is also a very rigorous and demanding process. Consider the following points of advice as helpful suggestions to improve your chances of success:

- Find a topic that genuinely sparks your interest. The Honors Tutorial provides a unique opportunity for you to work on a topic of your choice with input from your peers and members of the Government faculty. It is one of the few chances you get to work on an issue that really matters to you. Since you will be tied to this topic for close to a year, make sure you are passionate about it! A compelling interest in your topic will hopefully motivate you to invest the time and effort necessary to succeed.
- Invest an enormous amount of time in your thesis early in the process (September and October). This is when your extensive reading and data collection need to be done. You want to be well beyond the “background reading stage” by the time you finish your revised proposal.
- Zero-in on a specific and precise topic. The Honors Thesis does not provide an occasion to expound upon all your views about politics and society, or to learn “everything there is to know” about a big topic. Rather, it is an occasion to pursue your interests within the context of an inquiry that is disciplined by the norms and methods of social science research. A subject like “Why do peasants rebel?” does not translate directly into an undergraduate thesis project (unless you are planning a large quantitative study of war). By contrast the query, “Why did peasants in Chiapas, Mexico stage an armed rebellion in 1994 while peasants facing similar circumstances in neighboring Oaxaca, Mexico have not?” provides a more promising starting-point for a research project. (Note the large amount of specific knowledge required to even ask the second question, precisely because it is so much more specific than the first question.)
- Throughout the process, stick to a rigorous schedule. The mandatory guidelines provided here give a framework, but you need to set a more precise schedule for yourself. Keep in mind that order of magnitude more reading and thinking will go into the 7-page thesis proposal than the typical 7-page undergraduate writing assignment.
- Take charge of your project: Remember that you are responsible for specifying a researchable thesis topic, developing a research design, finding appropriate research materials in the library and elsewhere, and structuring the presentation of your results. Graduating with “Special Honors in Government” means that you have successfully met these challenges. The Honors Advisor and your thesis supervisor play an indispensable role by providing suggestions, guidance, and feedback, but the faculty advisors cannot accomplish these tasks for you. You are not alone in this endeavor, but the essence of the task is mobilizing and channeling your own creativity, analytic skills, perseverance, knowledge of a particular subject matter, and intellectual drive.

University Writing Center

I strongly encourage you to use the Undergraduate Writing Center, FAC 211, 471-6222. On-line at (<http://www.uwc.utexas.edu/>).

The Undergraduate Writing Center offers free, individualized, expert help with writing for any UT undergraduate, by appointment or on a drop-in basis. Any undergraduate enrolled in a course at UT can visit the UWC for assistance with any writing project. They work with students from every department on campus, for both academic and non-academic writing. Their services are not just for writing with “problems.” Getting feedback from an informed audience is a normal part of a successful writing project. Consultants help students develop strategies to improve their writing. The assistance they provide is intended

to foster independence. Each student determines how to use the consultant's advice. The consultants are trained to help you work on your writing in ways that preserve the integrity of your work.

UWC is open from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Thursday and from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Friday. UWC serves students on a walk-in or appointment basis.

Class Schedule

All class meetings and individual consultations are mandatory. Attendance and participation will be factored into students' final grade.

Week 1: Introduction

Readings:

- David Brooks, "The Question-Driven Life", *New York Times*, August 19, 2011
- Janet Buttolph Johnson and H.T. Reynolds, *Political Science Research Methods*, 5th edition, CQ Press, 2005, Chapters 1 & 2.
- W. Phillips Shively, *The Craft of Political Research*, 5th edition, Prentice-Hall, Chapter 1, pp.1-12.
- Barbara Ehrenreich "We need not just jobs but jobs that pay" CNN, August 16, 2011
- Mitchell Schnurman "Texas' low-paying jobs aren't the whole story." Ft. Worth Star Telegram, August 16, 2011

Optional: W. Phillips Shively (ed.) *The Research Process in Political Science*. Itasca: F. E. Peacock, 1984. (This collection of 7 articles devoted to empirical research in all subfield of political science includes essays written by each author about the research process that lead to their discoveries. It is a book about how political scientists do political science.)

Questions for discussion:

1. What is "scientific" vs. other types of knowledge"?
2. How do *normative* and *empirical* claims differ?
3. Is political science really "science"?
4. What is a "why" question?
5. What political/social/economic issues do you *care* about?
6. What is your tentative puzzle or research question?

Be sure to review the UT Library's "How do I get started with my research?" page:
<http://wiki.lib.utexas.edu/hdi/pmwiki.php/Main/StartMyResearch>

Week 2: Making Causal Arguments

Readings:

- Janet Buttolph Johnson and H.T. Reynolds, *Political Science Research Methods*, 5th edition, CQ Press, 2005, Chapters 3 (5) & 4 (3).
- Justin Greaves & Wyn Grant (2010) “Crossing the Interdisciplinary Divide” *Political Studies* 58: 320-339.

Contemporary Issues I: (Smoking) Cell Phones & Cancer

- Editorial: “Our View: The cancer question and cellular phones.” *Pasadena Star News* (06/03/11)
- Gary Markstein, Cell phones and cancer. (06/01/11)
- Ross, “Using cell phone has priority over cancer warning.” *Yuma Sun* (06/19/11)
- Martin Rössli, Patrizia Frei, Evelyn Mohler & Kerstin Hug “Systematic review on the health effects of exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields from mobile phone base stations.” *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* (<http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/88/12/09-071852/en/#>)
- Picard “The big cancer risk is the sun, not the cellphone.” *Globe & Mail* (06/16/11)
- Interphone: “Brain Tumour Risk in Relation to Mobile Phone Use.” *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2010
- Lowe (2009) *Brain Cancer: Beating the Odds*. Free on-line book.
- National Cancer Institute “Fact Sheet--Cell Phones & Cancer Risk” (05/19/10)

Contemporary Issues II: NFL & Crime

- Anon., “Ray Lewis discusses lockout issues” *ESPN* (05/25/11)
- Fenton, “Putting Ray Lewis crime prediction to the test” *Baltimore Sun* (05/24/11)
- Blog, “Ray Rice backs Ray Lewis comments” *Baltimore Sun* (05/25/11)
- DiMauro, “A simple mistake? Please...” *New London Day* (05/25/11)
- Molinaro, “What’s truly criminal is Lewis perspective on the NFL lockout.” *Norfolk Virginia Pilot* (05/25/11)
- Smallwood “Ray Lewis a Raven lunatic to think well turn to crime without NFL” *Philadelphia Inquirer* (05/23/11)
- “Did Ray Lewis think through this crime thing.” *RealRedskins* (05/23/11)
- Robinson, “Despite Lewis claims NFL lockout might actually throw crime rate for a loss.” *Salt Lake Deseret News* (05/25/11)
- “The economic wisdom of Ray Lewis.” *SportsEconomist* (05/23/11)
- Gregory, “Ray Lewis NFL Lockout Could Cause Crime Spike.” *Time* (05/24/11)
- “Ravens Ray Lewis warns of spike in crime if NFL season is lost.” *USA Today* (05/24/11)
- “Arrington Backing up Ray Lewis. Crime will rise if there is no NFL season” *Washington Post* (05/25/11)
- Daly, “Civilizations at stake if NFL stays locked out” *Washington Times* (05/26/11)

Questions for discussion:

1. What is the dependent variable? What are the main independent variables? What is the hypothesis? What is the unit of analysis? What cross-sectional and time-series comparisons does? How would we fulfill the criteria for causality? (What is the proposed causal mechanism?) What potentially confounding variables exist and how would we deal with this problem?
2. Think about one of your classmate’s proposals. What is the research question? Describe the dependent variable, the hypotheses, and the main independent/explanatory variable.

Week 3: Measuring Concepts

Readings:

- Janet Buttolph Johnson and H.T. Reynolds, *Political Science Research Methods*, 5th edition, CQ Press, 2005, Chapters 4 (3) & 6 (4).

Generally:

*Stephen Jay Gould (1978) "Morton's Ranking Of Races By Cranial Capacity: Unconscious Manipulation Of Data May Be A Scientific Norm." *Science* 5 May 1978: Vol. 200, no. 4341 pp. 503-509

Stephen Jay Gould (1981/1996) *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Chapter 2 – American Polygeny & Craniometry before Darwin

Chapter 3 – Measuring Heads

Criticism of Gould's work:

Arthur R. Jensen (1982) "The Debunking Of Scientific Fossils And Straw Persons." *Contemporary Education Review*. Volume 1, Number 2, pp. 121- 135.

Jason E. Lewis, David DeGusta, Marc R. Meyer, Janet M. Monge, Alen E. Mann, & Ralph L. Holloway (2011) "The Mismeasure of Science: Stephen Jay Gould versus Samuel George Morton on Skulls and Bias." *PLoS Biology* 9(6): e1001071.

In Political Science:

A. Democracy

Gerardo L. Munck & Jay Verkuilen (2000) "Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." American Political Science Association, Washington DC, August 2000.

*Gerardo L. Munck & Jay Verkuilen (2002) "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies*. February 2002 vol. 35 no. 1 5-34. From a UT computer, go to <http://cps.sagepub.com/content/vol35/issue1/>

Gerardo L. Munck (2009) *Measuring Democracy: A Bridge between Scholarship and Politics*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Kenneth A. Bollen (1980) "Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 45, No. 3: 370-

Kenneth A. Bollen (1990) "Political Democracy: Conceptual and Measurement Traps." *Studies in Comparative International Development* ." [Volume 25, Number 1](#), 7-24

Zachery Elkins (2000) "Gradations of democracy? Empirical tests of alternative conceptualizations." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44 (2): 287-294

Tatu Vanhanen (2000) "A New Dataset for Measuring Democracy, 1810-1998." *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 37 no. 2, 251-265

Matthijs Bogaards (2007) "Measuring Democracy through Election Outcomes: A Critique with African Data." *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 40 no. 10, 1211-1237.

B. Public Opinion

I. Partisanship

Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller (1954) *The Voter Decides* (Chapter 7), Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes (1960) *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley.

*Herbert F. Weisberg (1980) "A Multidimensional Conceptualization of Party Identification." *Political Behavior*. Vol. 2, Number 1, 33-60,

*Charles D. Hadley (1985) "Dual Partisan Identification in the South." *Journal of Politics*, 47: 254-268

Dee Allsop and Herbert F. Weisberg (1988) "Measuring Change in Party Identification in an Election Campaign." *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 32, No. 4, 996-1017

Steven Greene (2002) "The Social-Psychological Measurement of Partisanship." *Political Behavior*. Vol. 24, Number 3, 171-197.

II. Postmaterialism

*Ronald Inglehart (1971) "The Silent Revolution in Post-Industrial Societies." *American Political Science Review* 65: 991-1017.

Ronald Inglehart (1977) *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*Ronald Inglehart and Paul R. Abramson. 1999. "Measuring Postmaterialism." *American Political Science Review* 93 (September): 665-77.

Darren W. Davis, and Christian Davenport. 1999. "Assessing the Validity of the Postmaterialism Index." *American Political Science Review* 93 (September): 649-64.

Darren W. Davis, Kathleen M. Dowley, and Brian D. Silver. 1999. "Postmaterialism in World Societies: Is It Really a Value Dimension?" *American Journal of Political Science* 43 (July): 935-62.

Paul R. Abramson (2011) "Critiques and Counter-Critiques of the Postmaterialism Thesis: Thirty-four Years of Debate"

III. General

John P. Robinson, Phillip R. Shaver, & Lawrence S. Wrightsman, eds. (1999) *Measures of Political Attitudes*. Academic Press (1st edition)

IV. Aggregation

*Gerald C. Wright, Robert S. Erikson and John P. McIver (1985) "Measuring State Partisanship and Ideology with Survey Data." *Journal of Politics*. Vol. 47, No. 2, 469-489. Stable JSTOR URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2130892> or http://journals.cambridge.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/abstract_S0022381600062332

Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro (1992) *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

James A. Stimson (1999) *Public Opinion in America: Moods, Cycles, and Swings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Questions for discussion:

1. Why is measurement important?
2. How do you know when you have a good measure of a concept?
3. What are the key concepts in your research? Begin thinking about how you will specify your conceptual definition and how you might operationalize these concepts.

Week 4: Research Design: Experiments

Readings:

- Janet Buttolph Johnson and H.T. Reynolds, *Political Science Research Methods*, 5th edition, CQ Press, 2005, Chapter 3.
- Harold Gosnell, *Getting out the Vote: An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1-3. [field experiment]
- Shanto Iyengar, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder, “Experimental Demonstrations of the ‘Not-So-Minimal’ Consequences of Television News Programs,” *American Political Science Review* 76 (December 1982): 848-858. [lab experiment]
- Donald Campbell and H. Laurence Ross, “The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding,” in *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems*, pp. 33-53. [a quasi-experiment]

Optional:

- McDermott, Rose “Experimental Methods in Political Science” *Annual Review of Political Science*, June 2002, Vol. 5, pp. 31-61. From a UT computer, go to <http://www.annualreviews.org>
- OPTIONAL: Watch the film “Obedience” about the Milgram Experiments
- OPTIONAL: Phillip Zimbardo, “A Pirandellian Prison,” *The New York Times Magazine*, April 8, 1973 about the Stanford Prison Experiment.

Questions for discussion:

1. How do experiments deal with the criteria for causality?
2. How well experiments satisfy internal and external validity?
3. How do experiments deal with measurement issues?
4. How do experiments select units for analysis (i.e., sampling)?
5. What are the ethical issues involved in experimental research?
6. How could you apply this methods to your particular research question?
7. What are the differences between controlled experiments and quasi-experiments?

Week 5: Research Design: Small N and Case Study Designs

Readings:

Research Design

- Theodore Meckstroth (1975) "I. Most Different Systems and Most Similar Systems." *Comparative Political Studies*. 8: 132-157.
- Arend Lipjhart "II. The Comparative Case Strategy in Comparative Research" *Comparative Political Studies*. 8: 158-177.
- Donald Campbell (1975) "III. Degrees of Freedom and The Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies*. 8: 178-193.
- Henry Teune (1975) "IV. Comparative Research Experimental Design and the Comparative Method" *Comparative Political Studies*. 8: 194-199
- W. Trochim & D. Land (1982) "Designing Designs for Research" *The Researcher* 1: 1-6.
- John Frenreis (1983) "Explanation of Variation and Detection of Covariation" *Comparative Political Studies*, 16: 255-272.

Two additional textbooks that may serve as useful background material

- Gary King, Robert Keohane & Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Henry Brady & David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Latham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Small N Comparative Research:

- David Collier, "The Comparative Method," in Ada Finifter (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, American Political Science Association, 1993, pp. 105-119.
- Irving Copi, "Causal Connections: Mill's Methods of Experimental Inquiry," in *Introduction to Logic*, Second edition. New York: MacMillan, 1961, pp. 355-366, AND pp. 368-371, AND pp. 385-388.
- Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen, "China and India" in *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, pp. 204-225. [an example of the comparative method in practice]
- OPTIONAL: Mahoney, James "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis" *American Journal of Sociology* 4 (January, 1999), pp. 1154-1164. From a UT computer go to <http://www.jstor.org>
- OPTIONAL: Michael Caren & Neal Armato (2002) "Mobilizing the Single Case Study." *Qualitative Sociology* 25: 93-103

Case Study Research:

- Robert Yin (1984) *Case Study Research*, Newbury Park: Sage. esp. Chapters 1 & 2
- Seymour Martin Lipset, "Introduction" in Robert Michels (ed.) *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy* (New York: The Free Press), 1962, pp. 15-21. [on using a single (critical) case to generate theory]
- Steven Levitsky, "Institutionalization and Personism: The Concept, the Case, and the Case for Unpacking the Concept" *Party Politics* 4 (1), 1998, pp. 77-92. [on using a single (deviant) case to refine theory]
- Henry Brady, "Data Set Observations versus Causal Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election" in H. Brady and D. Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005, pp. 267-271. [on using a single case to test causal mechanisms or what Brady calls "causal process observations"]
- Gerring, John "Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method?" *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 3

- (March), 2007: 231-253. From a UT computer go to <http://cps.sagepub.com/content/vol40/issue3/>
- Barbara Geddes, *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003, pp. 89-106. [on the important issue of case selection in small N research]

Validity & Reliability

- Yu&Ohlund (2010) “Threats to Validity of Research Design”
- Donald Campbell & Donald Fiske (1959) “Convergent and Discriminant Validation” *Psychological Bulletin*, 81-105.
- Jerome Kirk and Marc Miller, *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research* (Beverly Hills: Sage), 1986, pp. 23-26 AND pp. 28-32. [on using a single case to improve measurement]

Questions for discussion:

1. How do small N and case study methods deal with the criteria for causality?
2. How well does each method satisfy internal and external validity?
3. How does each method deal with measurement issues?
4. How does each method select units for analysis (i.e., sampling)?
5. What are the differences, if any, between the type of data that are typically gathered for small N and case study research versus large N and experimental research?
6. What are the ethical issues involved in small N and case study research?
7. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these methods compared to each other and to experiments and large N methods?
8. How could you apply each of these methods to your particular research question?

Week 6: Research Design: Large N Research

- David Moore, *Statistics: Concepts and Controversies*, 2nd edition. New York: WH Freeman, pp. 3-18. [sampling in large N research]
- Bruhn, Kathleen and Kenneth F. Greene, “Elite Polarization Meets Mass Moderation in Mexico's 2006 Elections” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January 2007): pp 33-38. [a simple example of survey research where the individual is the unit of analysis]
- Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi, “Modernization: Theories and Facts” *World Politics* 49.2 (1997) 155-183. [An example of quantitative research based on a census where country is the unit of analysis]

Questions for discussion:

1. How do experiments and large N research deal with the criteria for causality?
2. How well does each method satisfy internal and external validity?
3. How does each method deal with measurement issues?
4. How does each method select units for analysis (i.e., sampling)?
5. What are the ethical issues involved in experimental and large N research?
6. How could you apply each of these methods to your particular research question?

First draft of research proposal due: 5-7-page proposal that outlines research question, variables, hypotheses, and evidence.

Be sure to review the UT Library’s “How do I find articles on a topic?” page:

http://www.lib.utexas.edu/help/howdoi/hdi_record_view.php?hdi_id=289

Week 7: Tackling the Literature

Readings

- Johnson and Reynolds, Chapter 5 (6)
- Greene, Kenneth F. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 1-5 AND 17-27. [an example of a pointed literature review with arguments and data against existing approaches]
- For an example of a literature review focused on conceptualization, see Levitsky article from Week 5 and/or Greene, *Why Dominant Parties Lose*, pp. 12-17.
- Givens, Terri, *Voting Radical Right in Western Europe*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 1-3 AND 13-17.

Questions for discussion:

1. What are your major hypotheses?
2. How do they fit in the context of scholarly or policy debates (be aware that there may be relevant literature that asks the same question you do and literature that asks a more general question that still bears on your research)?
3. Can you present a typology of competing views from the existing literature (remember that these may include competing views about the definition of the concept under study AND competing views of the causes of your dependent variable)?

Week 8: Gathering Data

Readings:

- Johnson and Reynolds, pp. 266-294.
- Robert A. Pape, “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism,” *American Political Science Review* 97 (August 2003): 343-361. [an example of “historical” research using newspaper archives]
- Re-familiarize yourself with Przeworski and Limongi from Week 3 as an example of using aggregate data from published sources.
- Re-familiarize yourself with Bruhn and Greene from Week 4 as an example of using interview/survey data.
- OPTIONAL: Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey, “Measuring Ideas More Effectively: An Analysis of Bush and Kerry’s National Security Speeches,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* (October 2005): 701-711. [an example of content analysis]
- OPTIONAL: Richard F. Fenno, Jr., “U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration,” *American Political Science Review* 71 (September 1977): 883-917. [an example of elite interviews and observation]
- OPTIONAL: Sanchez-Jankowski, Martin “Representation, Responsibility and Reliability in Participant-Observation,” Tim May (ed.), *Qualitative Research in Action* (London: Sage Publications, 2002), pp. 144-160. [an example of non-elite observation]

Questions for discussion:

1. What types of data can be collected from the “written record”?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of using the historical record, analyzing texts for content, using published quantitative data, using data from interviews, or using data from surveys? How do these techniques deal with measurement, internal validity, and external validity?
3. Do each of these techniques favor any of the research designs we studied in prior weeks?
4. Could you apply any of these techniques to your research question? If so, how? Where would you look for appropriate data? Will you need to learn any new analytical techniques to analyze these data?

Week 9: Data Analysis, Writing and Presentation

A. DATA ANALYSIS

SPSS, Stata and other statistical tools

OPTIONAL workshop on basic statistical analyses. Time and place TBD.

B. VISUALIZATION

Dona M. Wong (2010) *The Wall Street Journal Guide to Information Graphics: The Do's and Don't of Presenting Data, Facts, and Figures*. New York. W. W. Norton.

The work of Edward Tufte:

- 1983. *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. (2001, 2nd edition.)
- 1990. *Envisioning Information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- 1997. *Visual Explanations: Images and Quantities, Evidence and Narrative*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- 2006. *Beautiful Evidence*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Michael N. Mitchell (2008) *A Visual Guide to Stata Graphics, 2nd Edition*. Stata Press

Links to sites:

Gallery of Data Visualization: <http://www.datavis.ca/gallery/index.php>

An Introduction to Stata Graphics: <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/sscc/pubs/4-24.htm>

C. WRITING

American Political Science Association “Style Manual for Political Scientists.”

Michael C. Munger (2010) “10 Tips on How to Write Less Badly.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 6, 2010)

Joyce S. Steward & Marjorie Smelstor (1984) *Writing in the Social Sciences*. Glenview, IL: Scott Forsman.

Howard S. Becker (2007) *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. (2nd edition) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams (2008) *The Craft of Research*. (3rd edition) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diane E. Schmidt (2009) *Writing in Political Science” A Practical Guide*. (4th edition) Longman. (ISBN-13: 978-0205617364)

Questions for discussion:

1. What types of data analysis methods are best for the data I have?
2. Can I present my results in ways to make my results have “impact”?
3. What “tools” do I need to complete my thesis in the spring?
4. What are the limitations in my writing? How can I improve?

Week 10: Individual meetings with Honors Advisor

Week 11: Individual meetings with Honors Advisor

*Revised 12-16-page proposal due November 8, 2011.
Be sure to circulate among classmates for input and suggestions.*

Janet Buttolph Johnson and H.T. Reynolds, *Political Science Research Methods*, 5th edition, CQ Press, 2005, Chapter 14.

Week 12: Class Presentations (15 minutes/10 minutes Q&A)

Week 13: Class Presentations (15 minutes/10 minutes Q&A)

Week 14: Class Presentations (15 minutes/10 minutes Q&A)

Wrap up and discussion the way forward (Spring Semester)

“Chapter 1” due. Be sure to give a copy to your thesis supervisor.

Funding for Thesis Research:

The University provides a number of sources of funding to facilitate undergraduate research. Below are a few sources that students should explore for potential scholarship and travel support. For more information about the following programs, contact the Office of the Dean of Liberal Arts (471-2141), or Priscilla Ebert (475-7586) at the Liberal Arts Scholarship and International Programs Office (GEB 2.308).

The programs listed below all have September deadlines! You'll probably need a letter of recommendation from your thesis advisor. This is yet another reason to meet with him or her early in the semester.

1. Undergraduate Research Grants: Provides up to \$1000 for specific scholarly research projects conducted by full-time UT undergraduate students enrolled in any department. These fellowships are intended to cover costs associated with academic research projects proposed and written by student applicants and undertaken with the supervision of a university tenured or tenure-track faculty member, lecturer, senior lecturer or full-time research scientist/engineer. For more information contact the Office of the Vice President for Research (471-2877). See <http://www.utexas.edu/research/about/awards-fellowships-grants/> for information about the application procedures.

Deadlines: Fall: Sept. 17, 2012; Spring: Jan. 22, 2013

2. Rapoport-King Thesis Scholarship: Provides \$2500 scholarships for Liberal Arts Plan I students planning to write a senior thesis in one of the College's departmental honors programs. Recipients are selected on the basis of academic record, the quality of the thesis proposal, and financial need. For more information contact the Liberal Arts Honors Office (471-3458). See their webpage at <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/progs/lahonors/scholarships/lah/rapoport-king-thesis.php>.

Deadline: Friday, September 28, 2012.

3. Liberal Arts Yearly Scholarships: Provides \$2000 scholarship for academic support; requires 500 word essay. For more information, contact the Liberal Arts Honors Office (471-3458) or go to the COLA website at <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/progs/lahonors/scholarships/lah/LAH-yearly.php>.

Deadline: September 21, 2012 at 5PM.

For additional resources, see <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/student-affairs/Programs/Scholarships.php>